6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

175 642 cratic Czar. By the time of Ivan the Terrible, the power of the independent landed aristocracy was suppressed, and the autocratic power rested now on a service nobility who were given lands in conditional possession depending upon their service and their loyalty to the Czar. These people therefore found themselves in a slave-like dependency upon the ruler who was likened to God, a situation that promoted political and social regimentation and fostered domineering-subservience relationships, thus intensifying the existing incompatibilities between the upper and lower strata of the Czardom.

[157] Domineering-subservience relationships are likely to breed humiliating experiences of self-abasement and feelings of wounded self-esteem which in turn might foster intense hostilities as well as compensatory ideas of grandeur. Thus in new circumstances, both self-seeking and power-orientation were reinforced in the upper strata, and manifested themselves in the oppressive rule of the nobility, in their extreme factionalism, and in their ruthless struggle for personal power and for the favors of the Czar.

[566] This trend of events, by the second part of the sixteenth century, led to establishment of serfdom and to direct interference of the service nobility and of the government in the communal and family relations of the peasantry. From this time on, the Church, the State and the landlords joined hands in strengthening the power of the Father and of the village elders and sponsoring in the peasant family and in the village community, dominance-submission relationships, absolute power and dependence, blind obedience and self-abnegation.

181 [579] The inevitable clash of this new power-oriented social philosophy with the old stateless and equalitarian values, was reflected in intense family and community tensions and in mass restlessness. Thus a weakening of power and of controls on any level—family, local, or national—opened the way to urges of destructive aggression and revolt against all the holders of power: the fathers, the village elders, the landlords, the Church and the Czar. Outbreaks of such extreme enmity were manifested in frequent communal riots, in mass vagrancy, in bloody revolutionary uprisings, and in widespread dissent from the official

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

643 imagine himself threatened by "enemies," and live in fear.[14] As
157 a defense against such feelings the Czar might be inclined to follow the advice of those of his officials who favored concentration of power and who advised against giving up any of his prerogatives or against any yielding to the demands of the opposition. "Constitution" to such a Czar and his camarilla was as dangerous as "revolution."

But such policies, which are rooted in a sense of extreme insecurity themselves tend to strengthen such feelings. Mistrust of people, fear of the "enemies," suppression of all opposition and tendency to concentrate increasingly the power in one's hands, to dominate and to demand absolute submissiveness is therefore perpetuated. Hence, power-relations in Russia of the eighteenth and nineteenth century tended to follow the pattern of rule established earlier in Muscovite Czardom:

661 The emperor Nicholas I ruled his country like a gamekeeper. Under
643 his administration of the empire, based as it was upon a system
566 of flogging, imprisonment, and exile to Siberia, the great could indulge their caprices with impunity . . . But . . . in reality . . . the masters were also slaves. Every man, whoever he might be, was dependent on someone more powerful than himself who could with impunity make him wretched, and over him again there was someone still mightier. The lord, it is true, lived in comfort, and the serfs in squalor, but that was all. They were all slaves, one as much as the other . . . I have seen both oppressors and oppressed at close quarters, and I can aver that the inhuman regime of bondage corrupted and depraved one as much as the other.[15]

625 Just as in the political organization of steppe nomads and in the Muscovite Czardom such relations of insecurity, mistrust, self-seeking, abusive domineering and blind subordination demanded an efficient system of watchfulness, vigilance, checking and counterchecking. A special attention therefore had to be paid to the institution of secret political police. Since the days of Czar Nicholas I, the secret political police, known as the Third Section, was placed above all ministries, and was directly subject to the Emperor himself, just as in the days of Ivan the Terrible. Like the Oprichniki of Ivan the Terrible the Third Section was the main agency of vigilance, the chief watchdog of the state. It

G. Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

brotherhood could still be maintained. Since the seventeenth century, however, expenditures for military campaigns and for growing ranks of salaried bureaucrats necessitated increasing state incomes which could be obtained without much delay. Since the state was industrially and commercially undeveloped, the only way to increase revenues was in finding new means to squeeze out of the peasantry a still larger part of its produce. Therefore the old system of direct tax collecting from the mir was found to function inefficiently on the estates of the nobility, and laws were passed which made the landowners responsible for the collection of state taxes from the peasantry. In this way ties between the manorial peasants and the central government were severed.[1]

As a result of such a change in the political structure, the manorial serfs became now entirely dependent upon the owners of the manorial estates. There was no more possibility for the peasants to appeal directly to the government. Between the government and the manorial peasants stood now the landlords to whom the peasants became exclusively responsible as a final authority in all matters, administrative as well as judiciary.[2] *Pomeshchik* was now looked upon as the "natural protector of people, their local judge, the guardian of their welfare, their tutor, the trustee of poor and orphans, observer of good order and law."[3] He was considered as the Czar's overseer and watchdog.[4] The patriarchal dominance-submission and protection-dependence relationships which existed between the Czar and his subjects were now extended to the landlord and his serfs. Both the Czar and the landlord were addressed as *batyushka* (father).

The position of the serf, however, was now so much more precarious because in new relationships the power of the landlord was absolute. A life-long banishment to Siberia awaited him who lodged a complaint against his master. And since there were neither written laws nor any established customary law to regulate the relations between the serfs and the manorial lords, the serfs were completely dependent upon the degree of moral or ethical standards of their masters for their lives and well-being. These were often very low. Hence unprotected either by

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

written or by customary rules of conduct and often exposed to the arbitrariness and mistreatment of their lords, the serfs on many manorial estates came to be completely dependent upon the will and capriciousness of their masters.

It is obvious that many landed gentry who were given such absolute rights over their serfs would tend to completely subjugate the mir also. In such circumstances the mir was likely to lose its character of a self-ruled and self-contained community and instead tended to become an instrument of landlord's power which made the landowner the absolute monarch of his estate. Under the overlordship of the estate owner the mir kept its watchful eye over every peasant, and made it easier for the landowner to manage his property, and for the government to rule the country. It was under such external pressures that the steppe traditions of an absolute, stern and distant patriarchal power were being strengthened among the peasantry.

II

The conditions of the peasants did not improve in these respects after the abolishment of serfdom in the second part of the nineteenth century.[5] The peasants were emancipated from the rule of the pomeshchiks and subjected again directly to the government. But now the government, pushed by pressing demands for increasing revenues, made the mir an instrument of state control and found in it one of the most exacting of tax collectors. In order to be assured of payment the state had to concede to the mir all of the most severe measures of authority. Now the mir was entitled to banish unsolvent peasants to Siberia. And when corporal punishment was abolished in urban criminal law practice, it was still left in use in the mir.[6]

After the abolishment of serfdom the mir came under the supervision of the district chief of police (*Ispravnik*). The law of 1874 gave the police the right to arrest and to fine the village elders, and even to demand from the governor of the province their discharge. The position of the elder became so undesirable that the mir sometimes had to exert force to obtain candidates for this office or to prevent those in office from resigning.[7]

There was another official in this system of rural administra-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

peasants. Such a situation in many cases bred extreme antagonism against the priests, especially when hostility against the priests was stirred up by systematic agitation, as in the case of various sects of Dissenters (*Raskolniki*). This agitation often took the form of folk songs:

> hairy ones . . . the beasts:
> These beasts are the priests
> They howl, like wolves. . . .
> • • •
> In the churches they praise the Lord hypocritically,
> And ensnare innocent people with their words;
> In the churches they offer glory to God,
> And send the Uryadniks to hunt innocent people;
> • • •
> And they drive innocent people to Siberia.
> In the churches they open their mouths,
> But before the government they keep silent.
> Their hair is long like women's,
> But their brain is a great deal shorter.
> • • •
> They howl like beasts;
> • • •
> They extort from all.
> Wicked hairy priests . . .[2]
> • • •

The peasants were attracted to numerous sects of the Dissenters which were spreading in Russia, especially since the seventeenth century when the great movement of the Old Believers (*Starovery*) began. In these sects and their ideologies the peasants protested against the conditions of serfdom. The teachings of a number of these sects expressed yearning for a new life, and for an anarchic brotherhood of men in which nobody would be rejected and everybody accepted on equal terms. Peasant Sutayev, for instance, who founded the Sutayevtsy sect in 1880, was considered to be one of the most pious churchgoers before he revolted against the official Church. He rebelled when he was over fifty. The occasion was a dispute that he had with his parish priest over a fee for the burial of his grandson. It was after this quarrel that he stopped going to

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

19
PEASANT UPRISINGS

I

EVER since the establishment of serfdom, slaves and serfs would free themselves from oppressive bondage by joining the gangs of vagabonds, fugitives from justice, army deserters, malcontents and escapees of all kinds, many of whom lived by theft, robbery, and begging. These victims of oppression, as well as many adventurers, gathered along the frontiers of the empire in "no man's land" where they would organize themselves as bands of freebooters, guerillas, and mercenaries, ready to enter the service of rival powers.

In the regions of the lower Don and Dnieper these communities of fugitives of all social classes and occupations and of many races formed elective military governments, known as the Cossack republics. Once they were established, these free Cossack communes served as a place of attraction to all who longed for freedom from oppression or who sought adventure. In these free societies no one was asked any question about his passport, his identity, his domicile, his faith, or his belongings. Everyone willing to fight and loot was welcome, but none was forced to come or stay.[1]

However, by the middle of the seventeenth century in these Cossack commonwealths, there appeared a social differentiation between the old settlers and the newcomers. The older settlers formed a property-owning class known as the "house-owners," and the newcomers became known as the *golytba* (the naked). And it was these unsettled and restless Cossacks of the "naked class" that played an especially prominent part in the uprisings of the seventeenth century and later.[2]

The first part of the seventeenth century, known in the history of the Czardom as the "Period of Trouble," was characterized by the lack of an established authority. The old dynasty had

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ended in a violent and mysterious way and a number of pretenders arose to take its place. It was in this interval between the fall of the former authority and the relative consolidation of a new one that the oppressed strata of the Czardom saw an opportunity to rebel against a state of humiliating bondage and economic misery. Seeking relief from their burdens and yearning for social acceptance in a system of equalitarian relationships, the poorer burghers, homeless Cossacks and runaway peasants and slaves flocked into the camp of Bolotnikov, himself an ex-slave and adventurer who marched at the head of this strange army upon Moscow. From his camp near Moscow he distributed proclamations inviting slaves and serfs to slay their masters, commanding all of his followers to rise against the voevodas and others in authority, and exciting them to rob and beat traders. In return he promised the slaves and serfs the wives and the property of the serf-owners. To all his followers he pledged honors, riches and the status of boyars.[3]

Search for security in a system of protection-dependence relationships manifested itself in a need for pretenders. If only a rumor started about the appearance of a pretender, whole provinces would rise to greet him. Sometimes a pretender had to be subsequently found to lead these masses of discontents who rose to follow a fancied liberator and benefactor. Such conditions only contributed to the prolongation of the troubled times and prevented an early establishment and consolidation of a new authority. It was in such a way that most of the seventeenth century became a century of riotings and rebellions which climaxed in the great rising under Stanka Razin in 1670–1671. Originating among the Don Cossacks, this movement soon spread to the Volga regions and developed into a general war of the lower strata against the upper classes. In this, as in the other uprisings of that century, many excesses were committed by both the rebels and the government forces. The same features of social struggle were repeated in the eighteenth century, in the great peasant rebellion that was led by Pugachev, another Cossack chieftain.

Also the nineteenth century witnessed a number of peasant rebellions. In the beginning of that century the peasants of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

could be achieved only if Russia was to change radically its economic structure. As a result of such a trend of events and of thought the government passed a decree in 1861 according to which the peasants were set legally free from their masters.

As a consequence of his legal emancipation, the peasant found himself in the possession of less arable land than before, and he was still bound to it. He was overburdened even more than before because he was obliged to pay high redemption dues in addition to the heavy taxes that were imposed on him. Moreover the peasants in land communes not only remained jointly responsible to the government for the payment of taxes, but they were also made jointly responsible for redemption payments. The commune's authority over the peasants was increased and the peasant found himself under an even more exacting and more despotic commune regimentation than the one that existed before the "Emancipation Act."

At the same time the peasant still did not have sufficient arable land. He also lacked pasture grounds and timber which were of special importance in his technologically backward and extensive agricultural economy; most of such land was left in the hands of his former masters. The acuteness of land shortage was especially felt because of lack of artificial fertilizers, need for draught animals, and primitiveness of farm equipment. Many peasants did not even possess a wooden plow.

But though the emancipation act of 1861 still kept the peasants bound to the land, and did not provide them with sufficient land, it did open up opportunities for their economic advance and political activation. By the latter part of the nineteenth century, the peasantry became generally recognized as a potentially very significant force, both politically and economically. It was this prospect of the peasant masses as the leading political power of the future in combination with the Slavophil idealization of the peasantry that gave rise to the ideology of *narodnichestvo* (populism). This ideology idealized the virtues and the creative potentialities of the peasantry, and just as the Slavophils, the narodniki claimed that the reconstruction of Russian society, even of the whole world, will come from Russian peasantry.

By the end of that century a faction of Russian radical intel-